REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated December 22, 2006 in which the Examiner objected to the drawings and claims 6-12, rejected claims 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

The drawings were objected to as not showing the removable cable cover. However, Applicants respectfully bring the Examiner's attention to Figures 6 and 7, as well as the description on page 10 of the specification. Since the removable cable cover is shown in Figures 6 and 7, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the objection to the drawings.

Claims 6-12 were objected to on formal matters. As indicated above, claim 6 has been amended to recite a removable knockout type cable cover. Therefore,

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the objection to claims 6-12.

As indicated above, claim 6 has been amended to incorporate part of claim 7.

The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 6 claims a terminal box of an output part of a solar cell module, including a case and an outer lid that are formed with a thermoplastic resin and a removal knockout type cable cover is arranged in the case. The terminal box comprises an inner lid and a cable base. The inner lid covers to close an electric circuit that is housed in the case. The cable base is provided in the case for insertion of an output cable. The output cable is held between the cable base and the inner lid. The inner lid and output cable are fixed by screws to the cable base.

Through the structure of the claimed invention having an output cable held between a cable base and an inner lid, as claimed in claim 6, the claimed invention provides a terminal box in which the outer lid and terminal box do not melt or catch

on fire when heat is generated at an electric circuit. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 6.

Claims 6-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Miller et al.* (U.S. Patent 4,851,963) in view of *Weiss et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,765,147).

Miller et al. appears to disclose an electric disconnect switch contained within a two-component enclosure consisting of a metal cover and a metal case wherein the cover cooperates with means integrally-formed within the case to hold the cover in an open position. (Column 1, lines 53-57). The interior pullout switch assembly components 10 are now depicted in FIG. 2 attached to the bottom 45 of the metallic case 39. (Column 2, lines 43-45). The neutral terminal assembly is mechanically attached and electrically bonded to the case by means of a machine screw 47. The case is formed from a single piece of sheet metal which is shaped into a pair of upstanding sides 43-44, a front 41 and a rear 42. A plurality of knockouts 49 are cut within the front, bottom and sides as indicated. These knockouts allow for wiring access to the line and load terminals contained within the pullout switch assembly. A separate metal cover 40 is formed from a single piece of sheet metal into opposing sides 54, 55 interconnected by a front 53. An oval recess 52 is integrally-formed within the cover to provide clearance for the upstanding T-shaped grip 36. An insulative plastic dead-front or shield 56 is arranged over the electrical components on the pullout switch assembly by positioning the pair of recesses 58, 59, formed on the shield, under a corresponding pair of tabs 62, 63, formed on the guide 24, and overlaying the platform 57, formed on the shield, onto the pedestal 61. The opposite end of the shield rests on the tab 51 which is formed within the front 41 of the case. (Column 2, lines 47-68).

Thus, *Miller et al.* merely discloses an insulative plastic shield 56 resting on a tab 51 which is formed within the front 41 of the case 39. Nothing in *Miller et al.* shows, teaches or suggests a cable base provided in the case for insertion of an output cable as claimed in claim 6. Rather, *Miller et al.* merely discloses a tab 51 formed within the front 41 of the case 39.

Additionally, *Miller et al.* merely discloses a plurality of knockouts 49 cut within the front, bottom and sides of the case 39. Nothing in *Miller et al.* shows, teaches or suggests a) an output cable held between the cable base and inner lid or b) the inner lid and output cable are fixed by screws to the cable base as claimed in claim 6. Rather, *Miller et al.* merely discloses a plurality of knockouts 49.

Weiss et al. appears to disclose metal or plastic electrical junction boxes and electronics enclosures or cabinets, such as for circuit breaker panels, machine controls and motor drives, are typically mounted remotely (for example on a nearby wall) from the associated electrical components. (Column 1, lines 19-23).

Thus, *Weiss et al.* merely discloses metal or plastic electric junction boxes.

Nothing in *Weiss et al.* shows, teaches or suggests a) a cable base, b) an output cable held between a cable base and an inner lid and c) an inner lid and outer cable fixed by screws to the cable base as claimed in claim 6. Rather, *Weiss et al.* merely discloses metal and plastic electric boxes.

The combination of *Weiss et al.* and *Miller et al.* would merely suggest to replace the metal case 39 of *Miller et al.* with the metal or plastic case of *Weiss et al.*Thus, nothing in the combination of the references shows, teaches or suggests a) a cable base, b) an output cable held between the cable base and inner lid and c) the inner lid and output cable fixed by screws to the cable base as claimed in claim 6.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 7-12 depend from claim 6 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7-12 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103 over *Miller et al.* and *Weiss et al.* at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

New claims 13 and 14 have been added and recite additional features.

Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

The prior art of record, which is not relied upon, is acknowledged. The references taken singularly or in combination do not anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time.

The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: March 9, 2007

By: Ellen Marcie Emas

Registration No. 32131

P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404 703 836 6620